



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/666,883	09/16/2003	Aleksey Sanin	AOL0073	8888

7590 03/09/2006

GLENN PATENT GROUP
3475 Edison Way
Suite L
Menlo Park, CA 94025

EXAMINER

CAO, PHUONG THAO

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2164

DATE MAILED: 03/09/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/666,883	SANIN, ALEKSEY	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Phuong-Thao Cao	2164	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 September 2003.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-25 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-25 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ . |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ . | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ . |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is in response to Application filed on 09/16/2003.
2. Claims 1-25 are pending. There are two claims 16 that Examiner considers as 16(1) and 16(2) and claim 17 is considered as dependent to claim 16(2).

Information Disclosure Statement

3. The Information Disclosure Statement By Applicant filed on 09/16/2003 was received and considered. A copy of the reviewed IDS is enclosed with this action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

4. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
5. Claim 23 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 23 depends to itself. It is believed that claim 23 depends to claim 22 and is considered as such in this office action. However, appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

6. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

7. Claims 1-6 and 14-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Overton et al. (Publication No US 2002/0032787).

As to claim 1, Overton et al. teach:

“A process for relating a service provider resource with a fixed identifier that allows resource requestors to consistently access a service provider resource without being affected by changes to service provider resource” (see [0002], [0008] and [0039]), comprising the steps of:

“providing request reception means on a central server for receiving a resource information request from a resource requestor for a particular resource” (see [0039] and [0040] wherein NDTP server is equivalent to Applicant’s “central server”, NDTP client is equivalent to Applicant’s “resource requestor”, queries to the NDTP is equivalent to Applicant’s “resource information request”, and the disclosure of the ability of the NDTP server to respond to request messages from clients implies the inclusion of request reception means as illustrated in Applicant’s claim language in order to process and respond to requests);

Art Unit: 2164

“extracting a service provider identifier from said resource information request” (see [0039] and [0040] wherein entity identifier is equivalent to Applicant’s “service provider identifier” and the NDTP server must extracting an identifier from the request message in order to lookup of identifier/location mappings and return a list of locations associated with a specified identifier as disclosed);

“wherein said identifier is a predetermined identifier” (see [0039] and [0056]);

“providing a source information database resident on said central server that contains cross references from service provider identifier to service provider resource information” (see [0045] and [0040] wherein indexed location store is equivalent to Applicant’s “source information database”, NDTP server is equivalent to Applicant’s “central server”, and the mapping between identifiers and locations is equivalent to cross references as illustrated in Applicant’s claim language);

“wherein said database contains resource information for all of the service providers within the central server’s area of responsibility” (see [0053] and [0054] wherein data repositories and application servers are equivalent to Applicant’s “service providers”; also see [0151]);

“wherein the database resource information includes, but is not limited to, resource description and resource universal resource locator (URL) address” (see [0045], [0056], [0057], and [0151] wherein geographical location information such as Chicago or Paris as disclosed is equivalent to Applicant’s “resource description”); and

“wherein said central server references said database using said extracted service provider identifier and retrieves an associated service provider resource’s information from said

database” (see [0040], [0044] and [0045] wherein NDTP server is equivalent to Applicant’s “central server”, location store is equivalent to Applicant’s “database”, and list of all locations for the specified entity is equivalent to Applicant’s “associated service provider resource’s information”).

As to claim 2, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 1 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Overton et al. teach:

“wherein said central server’s area of responsibility is locality, assignment, or trusted based” (see [0053], [0054], [0121], [0122], [0144] and [0151] wherein each NDTP server is equivalent to Applicant’s “central server” and the disclosure of membership permission [0053], each NDTP server in the cluster containing a different portion of a pool of associated identifier and location information [0054] and splitting based on local policy are equivalent to “trusted based”, “assignment” and “locality” as illustrated in Applicant’s claim language).

As to claim 3, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 1 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Overton et al. teach:

“wherein said service provider identifier is a universal resource identifier (URI)” (see [0151]).

As to claim 4, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 1 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Overton et al. teach:

“wherein said central server returns the retrieved service provider resource information to said resource requestor” (see [0040] wherein NDTP server is equivalent to Applicant’s “central server”, client is equivalent to Applicant’s “resource requestor”, and list of all locations for the specified entity is equivalent to Applicant’s “retrieved service provider resource information”).

As to claim 5, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 4 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Overton et al. teach:

“wherein said central server verifies said resource information request before returning the retrieved service provider resource information” (see [0122] wherein NDTP is equivalent to Applicant’s “central server”).

As to claim 6, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 1 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Overton et al. teach:

“wherein said resource requestor uses the URL from the retrieved service provider resource information to access the resource from the service provider” (see [0040] and [0151] wherein client is equivalent to Applicant’s “resource requestor”).

As to claim 14, Overton et al. teach:

“A apparatus for relating a service provider resource with a fixed identifier that allows resource requestors to consistently access a service provider resource without being affected by changes to service provider resource” (see [0002], [0008] and [0039]), comprising the steps of:

“request reception means on a central server for receiving a resource information request from a resource requestor for a particular resource” (see [0039] and [0040] wherein NDTP server is equivalent to Applicant’s “central server”, NDTP client is equivalent to Applicant’s “resource requestor”, queries to the NDTP is equivalent to Applicant’s “resource information request”, and the disclosure of the ability of the NDTP server to respond to request messages from clients implies the inclusion of request reception means as illustrated in Applicant’s claim language in order to process and respond to requests);

“a module for extracting a service provider identifier from said resource information request” (see [0039] and [0040] wherein entity identifier is equivalent to Applicant’s “service provider identifier” and the NDTP server must have a way for extracting an identifier from the request message in order to lookup of identifier/location mappings and return a list of locations associated with a specified identifier as disclosed);

“wherein said identifier is a predetermined identifier” (see [0039] and [0056]);

“a source information database resident on said central server that contains cross references from service provider identifier to service provider resource information” (see [0045] and [0040] wherein indexed location store is equivalent to Applicant’s “source information database”, NDTP server is equivalent to Applicant’s “central server”, and the mapping between

identifiers and locations is equivalent to cross references as illustrated in Applicant's claim language);

“wherein said database contains resource information for all of the service providers within the central server’s area of responsibility” (see [0053] and [0054] wherein data repositories and application servers are equivalent to Applicant’s “service providers”; also see [0151]);

“wherein the database resource information includes, but is not limited to, resource description and resource universal resource locator (URL) address” (see [0045], [0056], [0057], and [0151] wherein geographical location information such as Chicago or Paris as disclosed is equivalent to Applicant’s “resource description”); and

“wherein said central server references said database using said extracted service provider identifier and retrieves an associated service provider resource’s information from said database” (see [0040], [0044] and [0045] wherein NDTP server is equivalent to Applicant’s “central server”, location store is equivalent to Applicant’s “database”, and list of all locations for the specified entity is equivalent to Applicant’s “associated service provider resource’s information”).

As to claim 15, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 14 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Overton et al. teach:

“wherein said central server’s area of responsibility is locality, assignment, or trusted based” (see [0053], [0054], [0121], [0122], [0144] and [0151] wherein each NDTP server is

equivalent to Applicant's “central server” and the disclosure of membership permission [0053], each NDTP server in the cluster containing a different portion of a pool of associated identifier and location information [0054] and splitting based on local policy are equivalent to “trusted based”, “assignment” and “locality” as illustrated in Applicant's claim language).

As to claim 16(1), this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 14 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Overton et al. teach:

“wherein said service provider identifier is a universal resource identifier (URI)” (see [0151]).

As to claim 16(2), this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 1 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Overton et al. teach:

“wherein said central server returns the retrieved service provider resource information to said resource requestor” (see [0040] wherein NDTP server is equivalent to Applicant's “central server”, client is equivalent to Applicant's “resource requestor”, and list of all locations for the specified entity is equivalent to Applicant's “retrieved service provider resource information”).

As to claim 17, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 16(2) and is similarly rejected including the following:

Overton et al. teach:

“wherein said central server verifies said resource information request before returning the retrieved service provider resource information” (see [0122] wherein NDTP is equivalent to Applicant’s “central server”).

As to claim 18, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 1 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Overton et al. teach:

“wherein said resource requestor uses the URL from the retrieved service provider resource information to access the resource from the service provider” (see [0040] and [0151] wherein client is equivalent to Applicant’s “resource requestor”).

8. Claims 8, 10, 12, 13, 20, 22, 24 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Teare et al. (US Patent No 6,151,624).

As to claim 8, Teare et al. teach:

“A process for relating a service provider resource with a fixed identifier that allows resource requestors to consistently access a service provider resource without being affected by changes to the service provider resource” (see [column 6, lines 10-25] and [column 9, lines 5-20]), comprising the steps of:

“providing request reception means on a service provider site for receiving a resource information request from a resource requestor for a particular resource” (see [column 10, lines 22-30], [column 20, lines 47-50] and [column 24, lines 1-15 and 35-44] wherein an instance of

the Resolver is integrated into the GO service running on a dedicated Web server wherein Resolver is equivalent to Applicant's "request reception means", service is equivalent to Applicant's "resource requestor" and dedicated Web server is equivalent to Applicant's "service provider site");

"extracting a service provider identifier from said resource information request" (see [column 24, lines 1-15] wherein network resource name is equivalent to Applicant's "service provider identifier"; also see [column 9, lines 10-15]);

"wherein said identifier is a predetermined identifier" (see [column 9, lines 10-15] wherein real name as disclosed is equivalent to Applicant's "identifier");

"providing a resource information database resident on said service provider site that contains cross references from service provider identifiers to information for associated resource of said service provider" (see [column 9, lines 40-60] wherein local database and Name Files is equivalent to Applicant's "resource information database" and Web server is equivalent to Applicant's "service provider site");

"wherein the database resource information includes, but is not limited to, resource description and resource universal resource locator (URL) address" (see [column 9, lines 50-65]); and

"wherein said service provider site reference said database using said extracted service provider identifier and retrieves an associated resource's information from said database" (see [column 9, lines 49-55] and [column 20, lines 20-35] wherein index is a subset of the database).

As to claim 10, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 8 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Teare et al. teach:

“wherein said service provider site returns the retrieved resource information to said resource requestor” (see [column 9, lines 50-55] and [column 26, lines 1-20] wherein Web application server is equivalent to Applicant’s “service provider site” and client is equivalent to Applicant’s “resource requestor”).

As to claim 12, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 8 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Teare et al. teach:

“wherein said resource requestor use the URL from the retrieved resource information to access the resource from the service provider” (see [column 24, lines 15-25] wherein the service 42 is equivalent to Applicant’s “resource requestor”).

As to claim 13 this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 8 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Teare et al. teach:

“wherein said resource requestor uses the retrieved resource information to display the resource description to a user” (see [column 26, lines 8-20] wherein set of metadata including in the HTML document is equivalent to Applicant’s “retrieved provider resource information” and metadata includes the resource description [column 7, lines 10-20]).

As to claim 20, Teare et al. teach:

“A apparatus for relating a service provider resource with a fixed identifier that allows resource requestors to consistently access a service provider resource without being affected by changes to the service provider resource” (see [column 6, lines 10-25] and [column 9, lines 5-20]), comprising the steps of:

“request reception means on a service provider site for receiving a resource information request from a resource requestor for a particular resource” (see [column 10, lines 22-30], [column 20, lines 47-50] and [column 24, lines 1-15 and 35-44] wherein an instance of the Resolver is integrated into the GO service running on a dedicated Web server wherein Resolver is equivalent to Applicant’s “request reception means”, service is equivalent to Applicant’s “resource requestor” and dedicated Web server is equivalent to Applicant’s “service provider site”);

“a module for extracting a service provider identifier from said resource information request” (see [column 24, lines 1-15] wherein network resource name is equivalent to Applicant’s “service provider identifier”; also see [column 9, lines 10-15]);

“wherein said identifier is a predetermined identifier” (see [column 9, lines 10-15] wherein real name as disclosed is equivalent to Applicant’s “identifier”);

“a resource information database resident on said service provider site that contains cross references from service provider identifiers to information for associated resource of said service provider” (see [column 9, lines 40-60] wherein local database and Name Files is equivalent to

Applicant's "resource information database" and Web server is equivalent to Applicant's "service provider site");

"wherein the database resource information includes, but is not limited to, resource description and resource universal resource locator (URL) address" (see [column 9, lines 50-65]); and

"wherein said service provider site reference said database using said extracted service provider identifier and retrieves an associated resource's information from said database" (see [column 9, lines 49-55] and [column 20, lines 20-35] wherein index is a subset of the database).

As to claim 22, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 20 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Teare et al. teach:

"wherein said service provider site returns the retrieved resource information to said resource requestor" (see [column 9, lines 50-55] and [column 26, lines 1-20] wherein Web application server is equivalent to Applicant's "service provider site" and client is equivalent to Applicant's "resource requestor").

As to claim 24, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 20 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Teare et al. teach:

“wherein said resource requestor use the URL from the retrieved resource information to access the resource from the service provider” (see [column 24, lines 15-25] wherein the service 42 is equivalent to Applicant’s “resource requestor”).

As to claim 25, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 20 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Teare et al. teach:

“wherein said resource requestor uses the retrieved resource information to display the resource description to a user” (see [column 26, lines 8-20] wherein set of metadata including in the HTML document is equivalent to Applicant’s “retrieved provider resource information” and metadata includes the resource description [column 7, lines 10-20]).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

9. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

10. Claims 7 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Overton et al. (Publication No US 2002/0032787) as applied to claims 1 and 14 above, and further in view of Teare et al. (US Patent No 6,151,624).

As to claims 7 and 19, these claims are rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claims 1 and 14 respectively, and are similarly rejected including the following:

Overton et al. do not teach “wherein said resource requestor uses the retrieved service provider resource information to display the resource description to a user”.

Teare et al. teach “wherein said resource requestor uses the retrieved service provider resource information to display the resource description to a user” (see [column 26, lines 8-20] wherein set of metadata including in the HTML document is equivalent to Applicant’s “retrieved provider resource information” and metadata includes the resource description [column 7, lines 10-20]).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Overton et al. by the teaching of Teare et al., since using the retrieved service provider resource information to display the resource description to a user helps the user navigating network resource more effectively. The resource description allows the user to identify quickly the relevancy of the resource before actually accessing the resource.

11. Claims 9, 11, 21 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Teare et al. (US Patent No 6,151,624) as applied to claims 8, 10, 20 and 22 above, and further in view of Overton et al. (Publication No US 2002/0032787).

As to claims 9 and 21, these claims are rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claims 8 and 20 respectively and are similarly rejected including the following:

Teare et al. do not teach “wherein said service provider identifier is a universal resource identifier (URI)’.

Overton et al. teach “wherein said service provider identifier is a universal resource identifier (URI)” (see [0151]).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Teare et al. by the teaching of Overton et al., since using a universal resource identifier as a service provider identifier provide an effective way to identify a resource in a network such as Internet because universal resource identifier is used to identify a resource from anywhere on the Internet by type and location.

As to claims 11 and 23, these claims are rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claims 10 and 22 respectively and are similarly rejected including the following:

Teare et al. do not teach “wherein said service provider site verifies said resource information request before returning the retrieved resource information”.

Overton et al. teach “wherein said service provider site verifies said resource information request before returning the retrieved resource information” (see [0122]).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Teare et al. by the teaching of Overton et al., since verifying said resource information request before returning the retrieved resource information provides an effective way to check if the request is from the authorized user or the request is valid such as to respond correspondingly.

12. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Call (US Patent No 6,154,738) teaches methods and apparatus for disseminating over the Internet product information produced and maintained by product manufactures using existing universal product codes as access keys. A cross-referencing resource receives Internet request messages containing all or part of a universal product code and returns the Internet address at which information about the identified product may be obtained.

Edelstein et al. (US Patent No 6,101,537) teach a universal electronic resource denotation, request and delivery system allows a user to locate information on a distributed computer system or network such as the Internet by knowing or guessing a short mnemonic alias of an electronic resource.

Davis et al. (US Patent No 6,718,331) teach method and apparatus for locating inter-enterprise resources using text-based strings called enterprise identifiers which acts as a handle to access resources from disparate sources and technologies.

Peddu et al. (US Patent No 6,931,428) teach method and apparatus for handling requests for content in a network data processing system.

Ishihara et al. (US Patent No 6,560,631) teach a distributed data processing system uniformly managing distributed data and program files. A resource management database associates identifier of resource files with their respective storage locations.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Phuong-Thao Cao whose telephone number is (571) 272-2735. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 AM - 5:00 PM (Mon - Fri).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Charles Rones can be reached on (571) 272-4085. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

PTC

March 3, 2006

Jules J. Messier
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2167